



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
08/468,437	06/06/95	HODA T	3408/589

E3M1/0513

SIDLEY & AUSTIN
4500 RENAISSANCE TOWER
1201 ELM STREET
DALLAS TX 75270-2197

NGUYEN, H

2604

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

05/19/97 DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 25, 1997

☐ This action is FINAL.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 20-25 and 31-46 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 20-25 and 31-46 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES--

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Art Unit: 2604

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 20-25 and 31-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not

Art Unit: 2604

commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

3. Claims 20-25, 33, 35, 38-39, and 40-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Orii in view of Sasaki et al and Takahashi.

Regarding claims 20-25,38,40-41 and 43-46, Orii discloses a camera apparatus (Fig 1) comprising:

a camera body (10);

first memory (26a) and second memory (24) for storing image information;

recording means and reproducing means (50) and (25) for recording and reproducing the image information;

changing means for changing the recording from first memory to the second memory by copying the image from the second memory to the first memory and for changing the reproducing the first memory to the second memory by stopping the reproducing of the second memory and reproducing the image stored in the first memory to the monitor (27) for viewing (column 12, lines 5-68, column 15, lines 8-28); and

Regarding claims 33,35,39 and 42, Orii further teach a finder (23) for displaying the image.

Art Unit: 2604

Orii further teaches that the second memory is a semiconductor memory but fails to teach that the first memory is a semiconductor memory such as a memory card as recited in claims. However, it is noted that employing a semiconductor memory device such as an IC card device which is detachable from a camera unit and the memory of SRAM kind for storing image signals and semiconductor memory reproducing means for reproducing image signals in order to reduce the size of the overall apparatus is well known in the art as taught by Sasaki et al (column 7, lines 60-65). Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Orii with Sasaki by providing the apparatus of Orii with the semiconductor memory of SRAM kind as disclosed by Sasaki et al as an alternate first memory of Orii apparatus in order to reduce the size of the overall apparatus.

Orii as modified with Sasaki fails to teach that the second memory is provided in the camera body as recited in claims.

Takahashi teaches a camera apparatus having a plurality of kind of memory which are provided in housing of a camera body in order to provide more convenience to the user when handling the camera (column 9, lines 20-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Orii as modified with Sasaki with Takahashi by

Art Unit: 2604

incorporating the first memory and second memory in the camera body in order to provide more convenience to the user when handling the camera.

4. Claims 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Orii in view of Sasaki as applied to claims 20 above, further in view of Finelli.

Orii as modified with Sasaki fails to specifically teach the use of a printer for the camera as recited in claims 34 and 36. However, it is noted that using a printer for making a copy of the image is well known in the art as taught by Finelli (See Finelli, Figs. 1 and 3). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Orii with Finelli by providing a printer as taught by Finelli into the camera apparatus of Orii in order to provide a copy of select image to the user.

5. Claims 31 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Sasaki et al.

Lang discloses an editing apparatus for comprising:
a first reception unit for receiving a memory (13)
a second reception unit (11) for receiving an optical disc (column 3, lines 58 to column 4, line 16);

Art Unit: 2604

signal processing means (26) for expanding the compressed image signal from the memory;

recording and reading means for recording and reading the expanded image signal on and from the optical disc (column 3, lines 58-62).

Lang further teach that the memory is a semiconductor (SRAM) but fails to teach that the memory is a memory card .

However, it is noted that using a memory card for recording image signal is well known in the art as shown by Sasaki . Sakaki the use of a memory card having a reception unit for receving the memmory card in order to reduce the size of the apparatus (Fig. 1) .

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lang with Sasaki by proving a memory card and a reception unit of the memory card as taught by Sasaki into the apparatus of Lang as an alternate memory of Lang in order to reduce the size of the overall apparatus .


6. Claim 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Sasaki as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of Watanabe et al.

Lang fails to specifically teach that the image signal is compressed in a DCT manner. However, it is noted that expanding a compressed image signal in a DCT manner is well known in the art

Art Unit: 2604

as shown by Watanabe (Fig. 2, column 5, lines 27-35) . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lang with Watanabe by providing apparatus of Lang with a DCT compressing and expanding as taught By Watanabe to compress and expand the image signals in order to improve the quality of the image signal.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huy Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-4775 and fax number is (703)308-5399.


THAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2600

H.n
May 12, 1997